

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-20 and 22 remain in the application. Claims 1, 2, 6-20 and 22 have been amended. Claim 21 has been cancelled.

In the first paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, the drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the supporting the clothing item with an air permeable supporting surface and supporting the clothing item by a gas jet must be shown or the features cancelled from the claims. In order to facilitate prosecution of the application, the drawings have been changed to correct the air permeable supporting surfaces. Therefore, the objection to the drawing is believed to have been overcome. However, it is respectfully believed that regarding "supporting the clothing item by a gas jet" is shown in the drawings because the nozzles 7 are shown on both side of the path of the article of clothing. Therefore, the drawings have not been changed with regard to this feature.

In the fourth paragraph on page 2 of the Office action, claims 1-3, 11, 18, and 20-22 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Dobson (U.S. Patent No. 633,819) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on page 16, line 8 to page 18, line 22 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1 and 20 call for, *inter alia*:

impacting the jet of gas on at least one portion the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion of the clothing item for dehumidifying the at least one portion of the clothing item.

Claim 18 calls for, *inter alia*:

impacting the jet of gas on at least one portion of the clothing item at an angle different from zero to the at least

one portion or the clothing item for dehumidifying the at least one portion of the clothing item.

Furthermore, it is noted that the present invention allows the use of a relatively high pressure on a portion of the fabric of an item of clothing. A row of nozzles is disposed along a path on which the article of clothing passes. Accordingly, the jet of gas is very intensive, such that the moisture is intensively blown out of portion of the clothing by pressure.

The Dobson reference discloses a device and method for drying animal skins. A stream of air is provided parallel to and between the skins to bathe the surfaces and take up the moisture from the skins (Fig. 2 and page 1, lines 100-103).

The Dobson reference does not show impacting the jet of gas on at least one portion the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion or the clothing item for dehumidifying the at least one portion of the clothing item, as recited in claims 1 and 20 of the instant application. The Dobson reference discloses air streams parallel to the skins, which bathe the surfaces of the skins to take up the moisture from the skins. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the jet of gas

impacts at least one portion of the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion.

The Dobson reference does not show impacting the jet of gas on at least one portion of the clothing item at an angle different from zero to the at least one portion or the clothing item for dehumidifying the at least one portion of the clothing item, as recited in claim 18 of the instant application. The Dobson reference discloses air streams parallel to the skins, which bathe the surfaces of the skins to take up the moisture from the skins. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the jet of gas impacts at least one portion of the clothing item at an angle to the at least one portion.

Since claims 1 and 20 are believed to be allowable over Dobson, dependent claims 2-3, 11, and 22 are believed to be allowable over Dobson as well.

In the second paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claim 1 has been rejected as being fully anticipated by Baltes (U.S. Patent No. 4,625,432) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The Baltes reference discloses an apparatus for drying and sterilizing fabrics. The apparatus includes a drying cabinet

with a means for suspending an article of clothing. Baltes disclose air flows which are a parallel to the article of clothing and that the articles of clothing are uniformly contacted and aerated by the air flow (column 5, lines 45-50 and Fig. 1).

The Baltes reference does not show impacting the jet of gas on at least one portion the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion or the clothing item for dehumidifying the at least one portion of the clothing item, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Baltes reference discloses air streams parallel to the article of clothing and the articles of clothing are uniformly contacted and aerated by the air flow. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the jet of gas impacts at least one portion of the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion.

In the third paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1-3, 12, and 13 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Dahman (U.S. Patent No. 5,361,516) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The Dahman reference discloses disclose a device and method for drying pants by blowing pressurized air inside of the

pants and allowing the air to flow through the permeable material for carrying the moisture away.

The Dahman reference does not show impacting the jet of gas on at least one portion the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion or the clothing item for dehumidifying the at least one portion of the clothing item, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Dahman reference discloses that pressurized air is blown inside a pair of pants and allowing air-flow through the permeable material for carrying the moisture away. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the jet of gas impacts at least one portion of the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Dahman, dependent claims 2-3, 12, and 13 are believed to be allowable over Dahman as well.

In the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1-3, 12, and 13 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Georges (U.S. Patent No. 4,592,497) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The Georges reference discloses a heating coat-hanger for garments. The hanger includes ducts for distributing hot air over a suspended garment.

The Georges reference does not show impacting the jet of gas on at least one portion the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion or the clothing item for dehumidifying the at least one portion of the clothing item, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Georges reference discloses that ducts in a hanger provide heated air to be distributed over a suspended garment. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the jet of gas impacts at least one portion of the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Georges, dependent claims 2-3, 12, and 13 are believed to be allowable over Georges as well.

In the second paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claims 1-10 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Fujita (U.S. Patent No. 5,713,137) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The Fujita reference discloses an apparatus for deodorizing sterilizing and drying bedding and clothing. In Figs. 6 and 10 it is shown that warm air is provided through multiple ejection holes. The warm air fills the case and circulates past the surfaces of the clothing.

The Fujita reference does not show impacting the jet of gas on at least one portion the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion or the clothing item for dehumidifying the at least one portion of the clothing item, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Fujita reference discloses that a multiplicity of ejection holes are provide for filling a case with warm air and circulating the warm air around articles of clothing. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the jet of gas impacts at least one portion of the clothing item in a direction not parallel to the at least one portion.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Fujita, dependent claims 2-10 are believed to be allowable over Fujita as well.

In the second paragraph on page 5 of the Office action, claims 14 and 15 have been rejected as being obvious over Georges (U.S. Patent No. 4,592,497) in view of Kellerhalls et al.



(U.S. Patent No. 4,304,053) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Kellerhalls et al. do not make up for the deficiencies of Georges. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 14 and 15 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the last paragraph on page 5 of the Office action, claim 17 has been rejected as being obvious over Georges (U.S. Patent No. 4,592,497) in view of Baltes (U.S. Patent No. 4,625,432) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Baltes does not make up for the deficiencies of Georges. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 17 is believed to be allowable as well.

In the second paragraph on page 6 of the Office action, claim 16 has been rejected as being obvious over Baltes (U.S. Patent No. 4,625,432) in view of De Pas (U.S. Patent No. 3,875,681) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. De Pas does not make up for the deficiencies of Baltes. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 16 is believed to be allowable as well.

It is appreciatively noted that claim 19 has been allowed.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either

Applic. No. 10/608,607  
Amdt. dated May 3, 2004  
Reply to Office action of February 2, 2004

show or suggest the features of claims 1, 18, or 20. Claims 1, 18, and 20 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 20, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 and 22 are solicited.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/608,607  
Amdt. dated May 3, 2004  
Reply to Office action of February 2, 2004

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner & Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



**Alfred K. Dassler**  
**52,794**

For Applicant(s)

AKD:cgm

May 3, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101



1/2




FIG. 1




FIG. 2



2/2




FIG. 3